

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. I.

NOVEMBER, 1921.

No. 11.

Little Journeys in the Higher Anticriticism.

PROF. TH. GRAEBNER, St. Louis, Mo.

I. The Myth Hypothesis.

(Continued.)

"Historic Doubts Relative to Napoleon Bonaparte."

Whately's *Historic Doubts Relative to Napoleon Bonaparte* was directed primarily against the skepticism of David Hume, but a few extracts from its pages will readily show how apt a reply it is to the mythological theory in every form. Archbishop Whately imitates the subject of his criticism to such an extent that one may read many passages and whole pages without being able to detect the slightest trace of the writer's irony. He speaks with a sober face throughout:—

"The celebrated Hume has pointed out the readiness with which men believe, on very slight evidence, any story that pleases their imagination by its admirable and marvelous character. Such hasty credulity, however, *as he well remarks*, is utterly unworthy of a philosophical mind; which should rather suspend its judgment the more in proportion to the strangeness of the account, and yield to none but the most decisive and unimpeachable proofs." It is reasonable, he concludes, to inquire into the evidence on which people in his day believed the extraordinary story of the exploits of one Napoleon Bonaparte, Emperor of France. He notes, first of all, a great dissonance in the testimony:—

"According to some, he was a wise, humane, magnanimous hero; others paint him as a monster of cruelty, meanness, and perfidy: some, even of those who are most inveterate against him, speak very highly of his political and military ability; others place him on the very verge of insanity. But allowing that all this may be the coloring of party prejudice (which surely is allowing a great

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Radicalism Rampant in the Anglican Church.

When Canon Glazebrook, in his *Faith of a Modern Churchman*, declared that the clauses of the Creed: "He descended into hell, He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God," as well as the resurrection of the flesh, "are now regarded by Churchmen" (*i. e.*, Anglicans) "of all schools" (High Church, Low Church, and Broad) "as purely symbolical," and that the virgin birth and resurrection of Christ must also be understood "symbolically," although "unquestionably believed by the early Church to be literal statements of facts," he set in motion a public controversy which now, after two years, has not yet subsided. But Glazebrook's volume was, judging from the reviews that we have seen, a moderate performance compared with the papers that were read at the Eighth Conference of Modern Churchmen which met at Girton, near Cambridge, in August. From all accounts it is evident that the radical wing of the Anglican Church regards the time opportune for a public assault on every fundamental of Christian belief. The papers read at Girton left nothing to be desired at least in one point—plainness. The authors accuse the Lambeth Conference, which strives to unite Christians on the basis of the Nicene Creed, of cowardly sidestepping the issue. To this creed, said Dr. Frakes-Jackson, "it is practically impossible for a man living to-day to give assent." Turning to his liberal friends, he said that they are losing the respect of Churchmen because, while expurgating the virgin birth, they tried to accept the rest of the Creed; they were "following truth [!] only to a certain point and there tried to stop."

The consensus of the Conference seems to have been that the time has come when the corollaries of the liberal position must be accepted, no matter at how great a cost to the feelings of the Anglican public. The dean of St. Paul's proposed—"Drop the three creeds." Canon Bindley thought creeds "neither necessary nor desirable." Others held that creeds might be retained, but not as a condition of membership or office.

The discussion centered about the person of Christ. Time and again sentiments were uttered at which Arius would have blushed. One speaker declared that "the Jesus of popular belief is largely a mythological figure." Another speaker mentioned that Christ claimed to be the Son of God only "in a moral sense, in which all human beings are sons of God, as standing in a filial and moral relationship of God and capable of acting on these moral principles on which God acts." Rev. Hastings Rashdall said: "Every soul is an incarnation of God, and in no other sense did our Lord claim divinity. God, who reveals Himself in all great teachers, did so in one man signally and uniquely."

No attempt was made to unite on a formula which would express the belief, or lack of it, held by the members of the Conference. The reporter of the *Living Church* (Milwaukee) quotes from Acts: "Some

cried one thing, and some another; for the assembly was confused; and the most part knew not wherefore they were come together." "For instance," he says, "it was urged, on the one hand, that for our confession of faith we should go back to the apostles; on the other hand, that we should go forward into the unknown; that we needed a new creed; that it was undesirable that a new creed should be compiled; that several new creeds might be produced of a provisional nature only; lastly, the most brilliant suggestion of all, that every clergyman should produce his own creed, which his congregation should recite with him; and it was anticipated that one creed would emerge as the winner of this creed-making competition!" The following is a new creed suggested by Dr. Douglas White at the close of a paper he read to the Conference: "I believe in God, the Father of all; and in Jesus Christ, Revealer of God and Savior of Man; and in the Spirit of Holiness, which is the Spirit of God and of Jesus; by which Spirit man is made Divine: I acknowledge the Communion of All Faithful People in Beauty, Goodness, and Truth; and I believe in the Forgiveness of Sins, the Glory of Righteousness, the Victory of Love, and the Life Eternal."

On one point, it is true, an agreement was reached — and that was that "*the old orthodoxy is now in ruins.*" GRAEBNER.

Comment on the Girton Papers.

Since the report of the Girton meeting was published, a more or less heated and very voluminous debate has been carried on in the British press, religious and secular. The conservatives endeavor to stem the tide of Radicalism. One of the first of the leading clergymen to take issue with the speech of Dean Rashdall was the Rev. B. G. Beurchier. Dr. Beurchier declared: —

"If the Dean of Carlisle is correctly quoted, his speech is as appalling as it is amazing. His conclusions, if accepted, would sound the death-knell of the Christian and Catholic churches. Christ, if not literally divine, was the greatest impostor in history. On the other hand, if He was not the Son of God, the whole Gospel is meaningless and unintelligible. The dean is reported to have said that Christ never claimed divinity. The truth is He never claimed anything else. And for that claim He forfeited His life. His every action and His every word, every miracle was performed in the consciousness that He was divine. Nature's laws obeyed Him because He was their Creator. Before His accusers He proclaimed as His answer to their query, 'Art Thou the Son of God?' an emphatic 'I am.' If we cannot worship Jesus as the eternal God, we have no alternative but to despise Him as our fellow-man."

Writing in the *London Star*, Bishop Gore said: —

"Our Modernists are standing on a very slippery slope. They abandon the miracles; then they abandon the Godhead of Christ and the Atonement — all against the evidence. Will they stop there? I think not. I feel sure that the denial of miracles and the abandonment of belief in Christ's Godhead will be found to carry with them an abandonment of the idea of Divine Revelation altogether, and those who abandon the specific Christian Creed will find themselves, not in Unitarianism, but much lower down."

A further instance of journalistic comment on the opinions of the Modern Churchmen is afforded by a letter to the *Sunday Pictorial* from Mr. Max Pemberton, in which he says: "According to this type

of orator, Christ was not incarnate of the Holy Ghost at all, but was merely the Son of Joseph and Mary. He performed no miracles. He did not rise from the dead, nor ascend to heaven. On the other hand, there are some of us still left who believe in the divinity of Christ, and who totally fail to understand how men who believe the contrary can honestly occupy the pulpits of our state churches and take money for teaching people to deride the ancient faith." Commenting on Mr. Pemberton's article, the *Living Church* correspondent says: "Strong words these, but none will say that they are not fully justified. It only remains to ask, What are the bishops doing, or going to do? They have all pledged themselves 'with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word.' But we have yet to learn that it is the intention of any of them to call to account the clergymen for whom they are responsible, and who appear to have committed themselves to the pernicious teaching of these so-called 'Modernists.'" He views the situation as exemplifying the "never-ending battle of faith against unbelief," and adds: "The Cambridge Conference is to be welcomed, if its result is to force the average Englishman to undertake the wholly uncongenial task of clear thinking."

Elsewhere we hear the middle-of-the-road men weakly allaying the fears of the faithful and as weakly faulting the radicals for their blatant unbelief. Canon Barnes of Westminster Abbey said in his closing sermon:—

"I weigh without prejudice, I trust, all that they have said. In the end I feel no hesitation in affirming that Jesus rose from the dead to become the living Christ, one with the Holy Spirit. We all seek for truth. But, whereas to some truth seems a tide destined to rise and sweep destructively across lands where Jesus reigned as a Son of God, to me it is the power which will set free new streams to irrigate His kingdom. Yet even those who seem, to the majority among us, to undervalue the supreme greatness of the Founder of our faith are eager to hasten the coming of the kingdom of God as He proclaimed it [!]. In His words we have prayed together, 'Thy Kingdom come.' And surely from such unity of practical aim, from a common conviction that we must work together in the service of Jesus [?!], we shall in the end reach agreement."

Rev. J. K. Mozley, Principal of the Leeds Clergy School, criticized the views advanced by the Modernists, but said that "it must not be thought that we have nothing to learn from them." He adds that the Conference was "composed of men who wished to remove difficulties which to them seemed to keep sincere souls from Christ." He did not think that the differences which separated them from others were unimportant—[not unimportant!]—, and he did not believe in the least that the Church would either abandon the use of the present Creeds, or find in the Girton papers an "adequate preservative [!] of the truth of Christ's Godhead." Yet "it was true Christian faith, even if not faith's last word, which inspired Canon Barnes to say that 'human thought will not sweep past Jesus, but will circle round Him as the center where God reveals Himself'"—!

Of course, Radicals everywhere rejoice in the forward step which their cause has taken by the Cambridge Conference. The *Churchman* (New York) editorially commends the Modernists for "*examin-*

ing with fine candor the fundamentals of our faith" and ridicules those who "raise a shout of alarm the moment some sincere scholar begins to talk about religion with the open candor with which scholars are accustomed to discuss everything else," — an identification of "scholarship" with Radicalism that smacks of anything but candor. Or shall we rule out such names as James Robertson, Cave, Orr, Urquhart, Sayce, Redpath, Green, McGarvey, Clay, Wilson, Warfield — to mention men of English speech only — from the ranks of Biblical scholarship? The *Churchman* then sees "cause for hope" in the fact that "in the Church of England, at least, liberals are not only thinking, but thinking out loud," that now "scholars are frankly telling one another what the Godhead of Jesus means to them in the year of 1921; what the Incarnation means!" . . . "Every man in the Church who loves the Lord Jesus Christ has a right to discuss his faith [!] in any open forum. It was a fine thing to have Dean Rashdall say what he thought. And it was also a fine thing to have Bishop Gore take him to task. Religion cannot suffer from sincerity and freedom." A "fine thing" for Rashdall to say that Christ claimed to be no more divine than "any other soul," — whereas even Arius still believed that the Son was uniquely generated by the Father!

While only an incident, though a highly significant one, in the development of Radicalism in the Church of our day, the Cambridge Conference at least impresses two lessons upon us:

1) It is an injustice to the memory of Sabellius, Arius, Apollinaris, and other destructionists of the early Church to classify them with the Radicals of our own day.

2) Unionism bears in itself the seeds of unbelief and apostasy, which only await an opportune juncture to sprout forth in all their hideous deformity. By its tolerance of liberal elements in the past the Church of England has sown the wind; it is now reaping the whirlwind.

GRAEBNER.

D. D. D.

From the *King's Business* we quote the following: "The Holy Scriptures have some terrible words of warning, many of them evidently not familiar to the Church in these days. Christ used them. Paul used them. John used them. Peter used them. And there are three words used by Peter which are most significant — 'damnable,' 'denying,' 'destruction': 'damnable heresies'; 'denying the Lord that bought them'; 'swift destruction.' 'But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.'" 2 Pet. 2, 1.

Some of the preachers of our time who write "D. D." back of their name ought to add the third "D" to show their true character, being false prophets who preach Damnable heresies, Deny the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves and others swift Destruction. It is very deplorable that this is a fact. But being a fact, it would be well that it be made known.

FRITZ.

A Question of Honor.

The *Watchman-Examiner* (September, 1921) writes: "We recently raised the question as to whether it is honorable for men to use well-known theological terminology to express ideas which are at variance with the generally accepted meaning of these words. The inquiry was provoked by these words from the *Christian Century*: 'Men of the modern mind subscribe to the same words as do men of the traditional mind, but the two types of mind invest the words with meanings that are so far apart as to be almost immeasurable.' The *Christian Register*, of Boston, a Unitarian paper, in discussing the question, says: 'The Baptist editor asks if men can do this with honor. We agree with him — they cannot. Modern men ought to use modern terms to express modern ideas. If the Baptists did that, or any other denomination, they would make a great disturbance. They would divide. We think for the sake of the kingdom of God, which, we are told on infallible authority, is first righteousness, they ought to stand in integrity, and leave not even a little child uncertain or deceived about their true belief. There are tens of thousands of Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Disciples, Congregationalists, and Episcopalians who do not believe, yet seem to believe, in an inerrant Bible, the virgin birth, the physical resurrection, the second bodily coming, the antinatural stories called miracles.'"

The demand which is here made is perfectly just. It is a crime to lead men to hell by denying the sacred truths of Scripture and teaching human lies instead; but it is more than a crime for false teachers to hide their wolf's mission under the sheep's clothing of orthodox terminology. The pronounced atheist may still demand respect, but the hypocrite deserves nothing but contempt. The rebuke of the *Christian Register* is well taken; however, it should follow its own advice and strike the word *Christian*. MUELLER.

Signs of the Times.

The *United Presbyterian*, June 23, 1921, has the following: "Two years ago 110 professors, representing fifty-three seminaries, met in Cambridge, Mass., to discuss this problem. Dr. MacKenzie, president of Harvard Seminary, reviewing the situation, showed that in 1915 there were in our seminaries 1,000 fewer students than in 1895, although the membership of the churches had increased greatly during that period."

This is not surprising. Having given human reason a place in their theology, the Reformed churches never accepted the Word of God as their sole authority in doctrine and practise. In other words, the Reformed churches never stood for positive religious truth. Today they openly ridicule the very idea. From this view-point we can readily understand their indifferentism, their union movements, their liberal position toward lodges and other antichristian societies, their fraternizing with all sorts of religionists, their failure to understand and to appreciate the conservative position of our Lutheran Church. They are, however, reaping what they have sown. Removing from

under their feet the solid rock-bottom foundation of the Word of God, their building must fall into ruins. They ought not be surprised that young men will not find a ministry attractive which, after all, has not a positive message to offer in so vital a matter as that of the eternal welfare of man. The sectarian churches are going from bad to worse, and the pity is that they are blind to the fact. To them the German proverb applies: "Wem nicht zu raten ist, dem ist nicht zu helfen."

FRITZ.

Reading the Bible in Public.

Reading the Bible in public—at the church services, at public religious gatherings, at the family devotion—is an art which must be learned. We agree with the writer in the *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* who says, editorially: "I am convinced that we are losing much in our public labors, as well as in our private study, by not knowing how properly to read the Bible." The following quotations from that editorial may well serve as food for thought: "We are told that anciently 'they read in the book in the Law of God *distinctly*, and gave the sense, and caused them to *understand the reading*,' Neh. 8, 8. To be able to read the Word of God like this is of inestimable value to any one, especially to those who teach the word in public. . . . The late A. T. Pierson, in a little pamphlet entitled, *The Reading of the Word of God in Public*, says: 'Reading without comment is my present theme. You should be able, by careful reading, without one word of your own, to make the full sense of most passages clear. Bear in mind two maxims: True reading is interpretation; true emphasis is exposition.' (p. 9.) Dr. Pierson tells of a friend in the ministry who frequently spent hours in private study of a passage before he read it in public. Yet how often we hear the Scriptures and sacred hymns publicly read in such a bungling manner as to give evidence that the reader had given very little, if any, study how to read that the true meaning might be brought out."

Edwin Booth, the celebrated tragedian, said with reference to the Lord's Prayer: "To read that prayer as it should be read caused me the severest study and labor for thirty years, and I am far from being satisfied with my success." Commenting on this, the editorial writer says: "If actors on the stage, whose work we cannot sanction, will, for money and personal honor and to be great in their profession, study how to give such expression to what they say, ought not those who handle the words of life to study how to read the Bible in such a way that the true meaning will stand out clearly and distinctly to the congregation? We fear that those of us who minister in sacred things give too little study to *how to read*."

FRITZ.

The Survival of the Unfittest.

The Eugenics Congress Confronted by Inverted Evolution.

That the outlook of the Eugenics Congress, held in New York during September, was distressingly pessimistic is asserted by Edwin E. Slosson in an editorial published in the *Independent* (October 8, 1921). Mr. Slosson writes in part: "That civilization is cultivating

a race of incapables in its midst is shown by various statistical studies. The Jukes, the Nams, the Kallikaks (or the kak half of them), the Zeros, the Ishmaelites, and innumerable other unidentified strains of defectives and criminals continue to increase at the expense of the community. Sanitary science, benevolent government, and Christian compassion are the highest achievements of human endeavor, yet their inadvertent interaction is to make evolution work backward in some cases and to promote the survival of the unfit. Dr. Horatio M. Pollock, statistician of the New York State Hospital Commission, says: 'The burden of mental disease is each year becoming heavier. The ratio of patients with mental disease under treatment in institutions per 100,000 of population increased from 118.2 in 1890 to 220.1 in 1920. The economic loss to the nation on account of mental disease now amounts to over \$200,000,000 per year.' Professor de Lapouge, the veteran eugenist of France, regards Europe as ruined, and looks to the Anglo-Saxon to save civilization through breeding, by selection, of a race of supermen who shall be able to master the complexities of modern commerce and non-Euclidean geometry. The foundations of the science of eugenics have now been solidly laid in the vast amount of statistical and experimental work that has been done during the present century. Psychology has recently come to the aid of eugenics, but it does not yet appear how this new knowledge can be applied for the advancement and salvation of the race.

"Eugenic measures are of two classes: (1) negative, those designed to check the multiplication of the unfit, and (2) positive, those aiming to promote the propagation of the better elements of the race. Of the negative measures the most prominent are (1) sterilization, (2) segregation, and (3) birth control. The first is the most effective, but too drastic to apply on a large scale, and, if applied on a small scale, cannot eradicate the evil inheritance. Up to the beginning of this year 3,233 cacogenic persons had been operated upon under these statutes, but such measures, though multiplied by ten or a hundred, would make no perceptible and permanent improvement in the average quality of the population. Birth control in some form is favored by most eugenists, but they have to recognize that its first effect is to make matters worse by restricting the propagation of the provident while leaving the improvident to multiply *ad libitum*.

"The positive measures for the promotion of eugenics appear no more practical and promising than the negative. Indiscriminate bounties for babies may turn out a dysgenic measure, since eugenics aims at quality rather than quantity. So the leaders in the movement are looking forward to the education of the people and the cultivation of 'the eugenic conscience' in individuals, so that it will come to be regarded as a public disgrace and personal sin if those who have received a fine inheritance fail to pass it on to the coming generation, and if those who have a serious hereditary taint should perpetuate it in their posterity. To educate a whole people to such a sense of their duty to their race would seem an impossible prospect, yet it is the best and perhaps the only way to accomplish this vital aim."

The sum and substance of the whole matter may be expressed by the word "failure." Both positive and negative eugenic measures have failed in improving the race; and now wisdom is failing the eugenists, and their last resort is the cultivation of "a eugenic conscience" in individuals. That attempt, too, will prove a failure; and so, after all, Paul was right when he wrote: "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." Human measures will not effect the desired improvement of the human race; with all the wisdom of the ages applied to the matter, there will still be inverted evolution. Yet there is hope for humanity. At the time of Paul the effete, perverted, and cacogenic generations of Greece and Rome were saved through the preaching of the Gospel, and the Gospel is to this day a power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. Instead of cultivating "a eugenic conscience," let there be the preaching of the Word of God!

MUELLER.

The Secret of the King James Bible.

"There is an established, inevitable manner," says Mr. J. C. Squire, the eminent English critic, perhaps the most authoritative of our day, "into which an Englishman will rise when his ideas and images lift into grandeur—the style of the Authorized Version." A true comment, and many attempts have been made to explain that superior literary excellency which distinguishes the English Bible. The high percentage of Anglo-Saxon words has been stressed, the rhythm of the sentences, the masterful use of cadence especially, and its restraint of emphasis have been referred to as constituting in their combination the secret of Authorized Version style. But while supported by extensive and interesting tabulations, this explanation seems to remain too much on the surface of the problem. In a somewhat unexpected corner of our reading we have lately happened upon an expression which strikes deeper and, indeed, supplies an explanation of that undefinable grandeur of the Biblical style which puzzles the critics. In the Riverside Literature Series edition of the Iliad, the editor in his Introduction, page XI, says that there is no really adequate translation of Homer in our tongue, and then continues:

"If a translation of Homer could have been made in 1611 as admirable as King James's version of the Bible, it would have remained in all likelihood the standard translation to the present day. Scholarship was not lacking at that time, nor a genius for noble expression, as the Authorized Version well attests; but a critical sense of restraint and responsibility was sadly lacking indeed. The Bible, of course, was an inspired work, where every shade of feeling and sense must be maintained at any cost; it must not be added to nor detracted from; the translator's first business was to be faithful and obliterate himself. Homer, on the other hand, was merely a pagan, with whom many liberties might be taken. His own whim, and the fashion of the hour, and a private ambition might sway the poet who should undertake to translate him; while the scholars who worked on the Scriptures dared not give rein to their fancy. King James's

version of the Bible is almost the one piece of work of the kind that has been supremely well done in English; and we may attribute its success directly to the restraint, the sense of responsibility, under which the translators accomplished their task. The sacred character of the writings, the universal reverence in which they were held, supplied just that critical influence, that balance and sobriety, of which the English genius is always so sorely in need."

Cogent, convincing, and well said. Extraordinary ability characterizes some of the more recent attempts to do the Bible into English, but it is safe to say that none of these translations will ever become the recognized volume of the Church. And what repels is not so much the modern quality of the English as the absence of that devoutness and reverence which alone can produce expression suitable to the august theme and purpose of the Bible. GRAEBNER.

The Mormon Counterfeit.

The most elaborate attempt to steal from the English Bible the thunder of its style is the *Book of Mormon*, together with that less known, but much more important document of the cult, the *Book of Doctrine and Covenants*. Christian Science has taken over the divinity circuit style of binding, but Smith, Rigdon, and their fellow-conspirators took over the language bodily and dressed their unholy religion in its folds. Not only do the "beholds" and "los" and "verilies" and the continuous polysyndeton,—"And . . . and, again . . . and . . . and . . .," etc.,—help to create a general atmosphere of inspired speech, but the great bulk of these writings consists of Scriptural phrases, and the style of the Authorized Version is imitated throughout. When God, in the style of Deuteronomy, gives detailed instructions to Joseph Smith for the formation of a stock company to build a boarding-house, the result is grotesque. As a characteristic instance of the use to which King James Bible English has been put, we quote from the *Book of Doctrine and Covenants* the famous 122d section, on which the doctrine of polygamy is based:—

Revelation on the Eternity of the Marriage Covenant, including Plurality of Wives. Given through Joseph, the Seer, in Nauvoo, Hancock County, Illinois, July 12, 1843.

"1. Verily, thus saith the Lord unto you, my servant Joseph, that inasmuch as you have inquired of my hand, to know and understand wherein I, the Lord, justified my servants Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; as also Moses, David, and Solomon, my servants, as touching the principle and doctrine of their having many wives and concubines:

"2. Behold! and lo, I am the Lord thy God, and will answer thee as touching this matter:

"3. Therefore, prepare thy heart to receive and obey the instructions which I am about to give unto you; for all those who have this law revealed unto them must obey the same;

"4. For behold! I reveal unto you a new and an everlasting covenant; and if ye abide not that covenant, then are ye damned; for no one can reject this covenant, and be permitted to enter into my glory; . . .

"19. And again, verily I say unto you, if a man marry a wife by my word, which is my law, and by the new and everlasting covenant, and it is sealed unto them by the Holy Spirit of promise, by him who is anointed, unto whom I have appointed this power, and the keys of this Priesthood;

"20. Then shall they be Gods, because they have no end; therefore shall they be from everlasting to everlasting, because they continue; then shall they be above all, because all things are subject unto them. Then shall they be Gods, because they have all power, and the angels are subject unto them. . . .

"28. I am the Lord, thy God, and will give unto thee the law of my Holy Priesthood as was ordained by me, and my Father, before the world was.

"40. I am the Lord, thy God, and I gave unto thee, my servant Joseph, an appointment, and restore all things; ask what ye will, and it shall be given unto you according to my word:

"41. And as ye asked concerning adultery — verily, verily I say unto you, if a man receiveth a wife in the new and everlasting covenant, and if she be with another man, and I have not appointed unto her by the holy anointing, she hath committed adultery, and shall be destroyed.

"44. And if she hath not committed adultery, but is innocent, and hath not broken her vow, and she knoweth it, and I reveal it unto you, my servant Joseph, then shall you have power, by the power of my Holy Priesthood, to take her, and give her unto him that hath not committed adultery, but hath been faithful; for he shall be made ruler over many; . . .

"47. And again, verily I say, whomsoever you bless I will bless, and whomsoever you curse, I will curse, saith the Lord; for I, the Lord, am thy God. . . .

"51. Verily, I say unto you, a commandment I give unto mine handmaid, Emma Smith, your wife, whom I have given unto you, that she stay herself and partake not of that which I commanded you to offer unto her; for I did it, saith the Lord, to prove you all, as I did Abraham; and that I might require an offering at your hand, by covenant and sacrifice; . . .

"54. And I command mine handmaid, Emma Smith, to abide and cleave unto my servant Joseph, and to none else. But if she will not abide this commandment, she shall be destroyed, saith the Lord.

"56. And again, verily I say, let mine handmaid forgive my servant Joseph his trespasses; and then shall she be forgiven her trespasses, wherein she has trespassed against me; and I, the Lord, thy God, will bless her, and multiply her, and make her heart to rejoice. . . .

"61. And again, as pertaining to the law of the Priesthood: If any man espouse a virgin, and desire to espouse another, and the first give her consent; and if he espouse the second, and they are virgins, and have vowed to no other man, then is he justified; he cannot commit adultery, for they are given unto him; for he cannot commit adultery with that that belongeth unto him and to no one else;

“62. And if he have ten virgins given unto him by this law, he cannot commit adultery, for they belong to him, and they are given unto him, therefore is he justified. . . .

“66. And now, as pertaining to this law, verily, verily I say unto you, I will reveal more unto you, hereafter; therefore, let this suffice for the present. Behold, I am Alpha and Omega. Amen.”

From the *Book of Mormon* we quote the following sentence, built on the model of Chronicles, but written in grammar peculiar to Moroni, the Revelator: “And they did cause a great contention in the land, inasmuch as the more righteous part of the people, although they had nearly all become wicked; yea, there were but few righteous men among them.” Strange business, anyway, this use of Authorized Version idiom, and frequent verbatim quotation from it, in a revelation of the angel Moroni written A. D. 400. GRAEBNER.
